UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,097	09/10/2003	Rainer Naeff	CCS-202-CON	4324

27777 7590 03/19/2010

PHILIP S. JOHNSON
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER	
KISHORE, GOLLAMUDI S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1612	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/19/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jnjuspatent@corus.jnj.com
lhowd@its.jnj.com
gsanche@its.jnj.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,097	NAEFF ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GOLLAMUDI S. KISHORE	1612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 February 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15,16 and 19-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15-16 19-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The RCE dated 2-24-10 is acknowledged.

Claims included in the prosecution are 15-16 and 19-23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 15-16 and 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant amends claim 15 to add the negative limitation "wherein said lipidic phase is not a product of reverse-phase evaporation". Nowhere in the specification, there is support for this negative limitation and therefore, deemed to be new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 15-16 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either JP 08 231417 or Maitani (J. of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 1996) by themselves in view of JP 61097229 or JP 08 231417 in view of Collins (5,874,075) and further in view of JP 61097229 (all are of record).

JP 147 and Maitani disclose liposomes containing erythropoietin. The liposome lipids include synthetic lecithin and cholesterol and phosphate buffer (note the abstract of JP; abstract and Experimental section in Maitani). As well known in the art, liposomal compositions have two aqueous compartments, one within the bilayer and the other outside the bilayer and the hydrophilic compounds are generally added to the hydrating medium such that part of it is encapsulated in the aqueous compartment within the liposome and unencapsulated active agent is in the outer aqueous medium. In both JP and Maitani, the unencapsulated erythropoietin is removed by filtration. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art not to remove the compound is such is desired.

Collins as pointed out before teaches liposomal compositions wherein hematopoietic factors including erythropoietin are attached to the surface of the liposomes. The phospholipids include dipalmitoylphosphatidic acid. The liposomes further contain PEG (stabilizer) and a phosphate buffer. According to Collins, such an attachment stabilizes the proteins such as erythropoietin. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated not to remove the external erythropoietin since Collins teaches that

erythropoietin outside the liposomes stabilizes such proteins. JP, Maitani and Collins do not teach the inclusion of glycine in the liposomal formulations. Such an inclusion however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of JP 229, which teaches that glycine is a stabilizer for erythropoietin (note the abstract).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that JP requires the use of reverse-phase evaporation in the preparation of the composition and the presently claimed invention does not claim this technique or products by this technique. This argument is not persuasive. As pointed out before instant claims are composition claims and not a method of preparation claims. As is well known in the art there are several methods of preparation of liposomes and the reference of Collins clearly teaches the classical method of preparation of liposomes by hydrating the lipid film with an aqueous medium (Example 1). Applicant argues that in JP the non-encapsulated EPO is removed by filtration and in fact the examiner admits to this. The examiner points out once again that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to not to remove EPO which is outside the liposomes, in the external aqueous medium because Collins teaches proteins such as EPO are stabilized when they are outside the liposomes (that is in the external aqueous medium). Applicant argues that the examiner admits that JP does not teach the use of glycine. However, JP 229 teaches that glycine is a stabilizer for EPO and therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use glycine in JP 417. Applicant's arguments that the examiner provided no rationale or merit based analysis as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would rely on JP 417 as a teaching or suggestion for not

removing the non-encapsulated EPO. This argument is not persuasive since the purpose in JP is to totally encapsulate EPO for the intended purpose and one of ordinary skill in the art would not undertake an additional step of filtration if removal of outside EPO is not necessary. Applicant's arguments regarding Maitani are similar to those of JP 417 and therefore, the same reasoning is applicable.

Applicant's arguments that Collins requires compounds be attached to the liposomes. This argument is not persuasive since Example 1 in Collins shows the incubation of liposomes with an aqueous solution of the protein and if EPO attaches to the liposomal surface by some interactions, then EPO would behave the same way in instant invention also.

Applicant's arguments that JP 229 discloses glycine as stabilizer for EPO but silent in EPO being dispersed within the aqueous phase and accordingly does not cure the deficiency of JP 417 and Maitani are not persuasive since this reference is added to show that glycine offers stability to EPO in aqueous solutions. Furthermore, as noted above, applicants themselves state that that their unexpected discovery is that the liposomal EPO compositions prepared under mild conditions exhibit improved stability. From the teachings of JP 229 one could argue that the improved stability observed by applicants is due to the stability offered by glycine and is to be expected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GOLLAMUDI S. KISHORE whose telephone number is (571)272-0598. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM- 4 PM, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krass Frederick can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gollamudi S Kishore/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612

GSK